

1 THOMAS E. PEREZ, Assistant Attorney General
 2 EVE L. HILL, Senior Counselor to the Assistant Attorney General
 3 GREGORY B. FRIEL, Acting Chief
 4 ROBERTA KIRKENDALL, Special Legal Counsel
 5 KATHLEEN P. WOLFE, Special Litigation Counsel
 6 NABINA SINHA, Trial Attorney
 7 MEGAN E. SCHULLER, Trial Attorney, CSBN 281468
 8 U.S. Department of Justice
 9 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. - NYA
 10 Washington, D.C. 20530
 11 Telephone: (202) 307-0663
 12 Facsimile: (202) 305-9775
 13 Nabina.Sinha@usdoj.gov
 14 MELINDA HAAG, United States Attorney, CSBN 132612
 15 SARA WINSLOW, Acting Chief, Civil Division, DCBN 457643
 16 MELANIE L. PROCTOR, Assistant United States Attorney, CSBN 228971
 17 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055
 18 San Francisco, California 94102
 19 Telephone: (415) 436-6730
 20 Facsimile: (415) 436-6478
 21 Melanie.Proctor@usdoj.gov
 22 ATTORNEYS FOR UNITED STATES, PLAINTIFF-INTERVENOR

23 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 24 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
 25 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

26	THE DEPARTMENT OF FAIR EMPLOYMENT)	No. CV 12-1830-EMC
27	AND HOUSING,)	
28	Plaintiff,)	
29	v.)	
30	LAW SCHOOL ADMISSION COUNCIL, INC.,)	NOTICE OF MOTION AND
31	<i>ET AL.</i> ,)	MOTION BY THE UNITED STATES
32	Defendants.)	TO INTERVENE AND POINTS AND
33	_____)	AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT
34	JOHN DOE, JANE DOE, PETER ROE,)	
35	RAYMOND BANKS, KEVIN COLLINS,)	Hearing Date: October 12, 2012
36	RODNEY DECOMO-SCHMITT, ANDREW)	Hearing Time: 1:30 p.m.
37	GROSSMAN, ELIZABETH HENNESSEY-)	
38	SEVERSON, OTILIA IOAN, ALEX JOHNSON,)	
39	NICHOLAS JONES, CAROLINE LEE,)	
40	ANDREW QUAN, STEPHEN SEMOS,)	
41	GAZELLE TALESHPOUR, KEVIN)	
42	VIELBAUM, AUSTIN WHITNEY, and all other)	
43	similarly situated individuals,)	
44	_____)	
45	Real Parties in Interest.)	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES
IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO INTERVENE..... 1

PROCEDURAL HISTORY 2

STATEMENT OF FACTS 3

STATUTORY AND REGULATORY BACKGROUND..... 5

 A. Section 309 of the ADA..... 5

 B. Section 302 of the ADA 6

 C. Section 503(b) of the ADA 7

STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE DECIDED 8

ARGUMENT 8

 A. The United States Is Entitled to Intervention as of Right 8

 1. The United States’ Application for Intervention Is Timely 9

 2. The United States Has a Significant Protectable Interest in the Litigation 10

 3. The United States’ Interest Would Be Impaired if Intervention Is Not Permitted 12

 4. The United States’ Interest Is Inadequately Represented by Existing Parties 13

 B. The United States’ Application for Permissive Intervention Should Be Granted 15

CONCLUSION..... 17

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

FEDERAL CASES

Ceres Gulf v. Cooper, 957 F.2d 1199 (5th Cir. 1992) 11

Citizens for Balanced Use v. Mont. Wilderness Ass’n, 647 F.3d 893 (9th Cir. 2011).... 8, 9, 10, 12

Cnty. of Fresno v. Andrus, 622 F.2d 436 (9th Cir. 1980) 12, 14

Enyart v. Nat’l Conference of Bar Exam’rs, 630 F.3d 1153 (9th Cir.),
cert. denied, 132 S. Ct. 366 (2011) 14

Greene v. United States, 996 F.2d 973 (9th Cir. 1993) 10

NAACP v. New York, 413 U.S. 345 (1973)..... 9

Nw. Forest Res. Council v. Glickman, 82 F.3d 825 (9th Cir. 1996)..... 9

Nuesse v. Camp, 385 F.2d 694 (D.C. Cir. 1967) 12

Prete v. Bradbury, 438 F.3d 949 (9th Cir. 2006)..... 9

Sagebrush Rebellion, Inc. v. Watt, 713 F.2d 525 (9th Cir. 1983)..... 14

San Juan Cnty. v. United States, 503 F.3d 1163 (10th Cir. 2007) (Ebel, J., dissenting) 14

Scotts Valley Band of Pomo Indians of the Sugar Bowl Rancheria v.
United States, 921 F.2d 924 (9th Cir. 1990) 14, 15

Smith v. Pangilinan, 651 F.2d 1320 (9th Cir. 1981)..... 11

Sw. Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Berg, 268 F.3d 810 (9th Cir. 2001)..... 9, 10, 14

United States v. City of Los Angeles, 288 F.3d 391 (9th Cir. 2002)..... 12, 13

United States v. Oregon, 913 F.2d 576 (9th Cir. 1990)..... 9

United States v. Oregon, 745 F.2d 550 (9th Cir. 1984)..... 9

FEDERAL STATUTES

20 U.S.C. § 1400..... 6

1	28 U.S.C. § 517.....	14
2		
3	29 U.S.C. § 794.....	6
4		
5	42 U.S.C. § 12101.....	1, 4, 5, 10, 11
6		
7	42 U.S.C. § 12181.....	1, 6
8		
9	42 U.S.C. § 12182.....	<i>passim</i>
10		
11	42 U.S.C. § 12186.....	4, 5, 12
12		
13	42 U.S.C. § 12188.....	<i>passim</i>
14		
15	42 U.S.C. § 12189.....	2, 3, 5
16		
17	42 U.S.C. § 12203.....	<i>passim</i>
18		
19	FEDERAL RULES	
20		
21	Fed. R. Civ. P. 24.....	<i>passim</i>
22		
23	FEDERAL REGULATIONS	
24		
25	28 C.F.R. § 36.104.....	6
26		
27	28 C.F.R. § 36.201.....	6
28		
29	28 C.F.R. § 36.202.....	7
30		
31	28 C.F.R. § 36.206.....	5, 7
32		
33	28 C.F.R. § 36.302.....	2
34		
35	28 C.F.R. § 36.309.....	2, 5, 6
36		
37	28 C.F.R. pt. 36.....	4, 5, 12
38		
39	CALIFORNIA STATUTES	
40		
41	Civ. Code § 51.....	1
42		
43	Gov’t Code § 12948.....	1
44		

1 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on October 12, 2012, at 1:30 p.m., or as soon thereafter
2 as counsel may be heard, the United States will present argument on its Motion to Intervene.

3 The United States seeks to intervene in this action as of right because it has a significant
4 protectable interest in enforcing the Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”), 42 U.S.C.
5 §§ 12101 *et seq.* Alternatively, the United States seeks permissive intervention because its
6 claims share common questions of law and fact with the main action and because the action
7 involves the interpretation of a statute the Attorney General is charged by Congress to implement
8 and enforce.

9 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**
IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO INTERVENE

10 The United States seeks to intervene in this action to remedy alleged violations of titles
11 III and V of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. §§ 12181 *et seq.* and 12203. Plaintiff, the Department of Fair
12 Employment and Housing (“DFEH”), brings this action to remedy systemic discriminatory
13 practices by the Law School Admission Council, Inc. (“LSAC”) in its administration of the Law
14 School Admission Test (“LSAT”). On behalf of a statewide class, DFEH alleges, *inter alia*, that
15 LSAC violated the ADA – as incorporated into the California Fair Employment & Housing Act
16 (“FEHA”), Cal. Gov’t Code § 12948, via the Unruh Civil Rights Act (“Unruh Act”), Cal. Civ.
17 Code § 51(f) – when it failed to provide required testing accommodations to individuals with
18 disabilities; when it subjected applicants who requested testing accommodations to excessive and
19 unduly burdensome documentation demands; and when it annotated, or “flagged,” such
20 individuals’ test results prior to sending their scores to member law schools.

21 The United States requests leave to intervene as of right, or, alternatively, to intervene by
22 permission, pursuant to Rule 24 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Intervention as of right
23 is warranted in this case because the United States has a significant protectable interest in the
24 enforcement of the ADA that is not adequately represented by the existing parties and that may
25 be impaired if intervention is denied. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(a)(2). Alternatively, the United
26 States moves for permissive intervention because its claims against LSAC have questions of law
27 and fact in common with the main action and because the main action involves the interpretation
28

1 of a statute that the Attorney General is entrusted by Congress to administer. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P.
2 24(b)(1)-(2); *see also* 42 U.S.C. § 12188(b).

3 PROCEDURAL HISTORY

4 DFEH is a California state agency that has authority under FEHA to enforce the Unruh
5 Act, which incorporates the ADA. *See* DFEH Compl. ¶¶ 1, 16, Mar. 16, 2012 (attached to
6 Notice of Removal of Action Under 28 U.S.C. § 1441, at Ex. A, at 8-83, Apr. 12, 2012, ECF No.
7 1). Pursuant to that authority, DFEH filed a complaint against LSAC on March 16, 2012, in the
8 Alameda County Superior Court. *See* DFEH Compl. ¶ 43; Def.’s Mot. Dismiss 4, May 17, 2012,
9 ECF No. 13. The DFEH complaint states five causes of action, all of which are based on the
10 ADA – as incorporated into FEHA via the Unruh Act – and its implementing regulations. *See*
11 DFEH Compl. ¶¶ 187-216.

12 LSAC removed the case to federal court on April 12, 2012. Def.’s Mot. Dismiss 4.
13 LSAC filed a Motion to Dismiss on May 17, 2012. *Id.* LSAC’s arguments for dismissal are
14 based in part on the ADA and the permissible scope of its implementing regulations. *Id.* at 13-
15 20. In response to LSAC’s motion, the United States Department of Justice (“Department”)
16 submitted a statement of interest opposing LSAC’s ADA-based arguments. Statement of
17 Interest, June 27, 2012, ECF No. 29. As the agency charged by Congress to promulgate
18 regulations to implement title III of the ADA, the Department explained its position regarding
19 the proper application of the ADA and implementing regulations at issue in LSAC’s motion. *Id.*
20 A hearing on LSAC’s motion to dismiss was held on July 13, 2012. ECF No. 38.

21 On July 27, 2012, three of the real parties in interest named in the DFEH complaint –
22 Andrew Quan, Nicholas Jones, and Elizabeth Hennessey-Severson – filed a motion to intervene.
23 Quan *et al.* Mot. Intervene, ECF No. 42. Their proposed complaint in intervention states four
24 causes of action, two of which allege violations of the ADA and its implementing regulation, 42
25 U.S.C. §§ 12182, 12189; 28 C.F.R. §§ 36.302, 36.309. *See* Quan *et al.* Proposed Compl. ¶¶ 48-
26 72, July 27, 2012, ECF. No. 42-3. The hearing on the motion to intervene filed by Quan, Jones,
27 and Hennessey-Severson is scheduled for September 7, 2012.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

1
2 The United States seeks to intervene in this action to allege that LSAC engaged in a
3 pattern or practice of discrimination against individuals with disabilities who took, or sought to
4 take, the LSAT with testing accommodations. Based on many of the same facts underlying the
5 DFEH complaint and the Quan *et al.* proposed complaint in intervention, the United States'
6 proposed complaint in intervention (attached as Exhibit A) alleges that LSAC has failed to
7 administer the LSAT in a manner accessible to prospective law students with disabilities, in
8 violation of 42 U.S.C. § 12189, by: (1) failing to provide testing accommodations so as to best
9 ensure that test results reflect aptitude rather than disability, (2) making unreasonable requests
10 for documentation in support of requests for testing accommodations, (3) failing to give
11 considerable weight to documentation of past testing accommodations received in similar testing
12 situations, (4) failing to respond in a timely manner to requests for testing accommodations, (5)
13 failing to provide appropriate auxiliary aids, and (6) "flagging" (or annotating) test scores
14 obtained with the testing accommodation of extended time. LSAC's policies and practices also
15 fail to provide prospective law students with disabilities the full and equal enjoyment of its
16 goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, and accommodations, in violation of 42 U.S.C.
17 § 12182, by unnecessarily flagging test scores obtained with accommodations, and by identifying
18 and reporting otherwise confidential disability-related information through the flagging process.
19 LSAC's flagging policy also interferes with individuals' exercise of their rights under the ADA,
20 in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 12203.

21 As a result of its discriminatory policies and practices, LSAC has denied prospective law
22 students with disabilities a full and equal opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge and
23 aptitude and to fairly compete for educational and employment opportunities for which the
24 LSAT is a prerequisite. The United States' proposed complaint in intervention recognizes that
25 Plaintiff DFEH has alleged a statewide class action and identified 17 real parties in interest
26 harmed by LSAC's discriminatory policies and practices. The United States' proposed
27 complaint in intervention specifically identifies eight victims of LSAC's discriminatory policies
28 and practices: Andrew Quan, Nicholas Jones, and Elizabeth Hennessey-Severson are also named

1 in the DFEH complaint and Quan *et al.* proposed complaint in intervention; in addition, the
2 United States alleges discrimination against Matthew Kaplan, Rachel Mech, Alexander Tucker,
3 Charles Whitman, and Lauren Wiehle. The United States further alleges that LSAC’s policies
4 and practices have likely resulted in discrimination against other individuals with disabilities,
5 and seeks relief under the ADA for all aggrieved individuals.

6 As credentialing examinations, such as the LSAT, increasingly become the gateway to
7 educational and employment opportunities, the ADA demands that each individual with a
8 disability has the opportunity to fairly compete for and pursue all such opportunities. The United
9 States’ participation in this action is critical to protecting the public interest in the important
10 issues raised in this case.

11 In enacting the ADA, Congress sought “to ensure that the Federal Government plays a
12 central role in enforcing the standards established [in the Act] on behalf of individuals with
13 disabilities” 42 U.S.C. § 12101(b)(3). To effectuate that purpose, Congress charged the
14 Department with primary responsibility for enforcing the ADA. *See id.* § 12188(b); 28 C.F.R.
15 pt. 36. That responsibility includes promulgating regulations to implement titles III and V of the
16 ADA. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 12186(b); 28 C.F.R. pt. 36. The Attorney General is also authorized to
17 investigate allegations of disability discrimination and to file suit where there is reasonable cause
18 to believe that an entity has engaged in a pattern or practice of discrimination or that an entity’s
19 discriminatory actions raise an issue of general public importance. *See* 42 U.S.C.
20 §§ 12188(b)(1)(A)(i), (b)(1)(B).

21 The United States’ enforcement authority under the ADA is directly implicated by the
22 claims alleged in this action, which reach core principles underlying the ADA. The ADA rests
23 on Congress’ determination that “the Nation’s proper goals” regarding individuals with
24 disabilities include “equality of opportunity” and “full participation” for such individuals, and
25 that “the continuing existence of unfair and unnecessary discrimination and prejudice denies
26 people with disabilities the opportunity to compete on an equal basis and to pursue those
27 opportunities for which our free society is justifiably famous.” 42 U.S.C. §§ 12101(a)(7)-(8).
28 The ADA’s requirement that testing entities administer examinations in an accessible manner is

1 pivotal to furthering the ADA’s purpose “to provide a clear and comprehensive national mandate
2 for the elimination of discrimination against individuals with disabilities.” *Id.* § 12101(b)(1).

3 **STATUTORY AND REGULATORY BACKGROUND**

4 Title III of the ADA prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability by public
5 accommodations and by entities that offer examinations or courses related to applications,
6 licensing, certification, or credentialing for secondary or postsecondary education, professional,
7 or trade purposes. *See* 42 U.S.C. §§ 12182, 12189; 28 C.F.R. pt. 36. Title V of the ADA
8 prohibits any entity from coercing, intimidating, threatening, or interfering with an individual’s
9 exercise or enjoyment of a right granted by the ADA. 42 U.S.C. § 12203; 28 C.F.R. § 36.206(b).

10 **A. Section 309 of the ADA**

11 Section 309 of the ADA provides:

12 Any person that offers examinations or courses related to applications, licensing,
13 certification, or credentialing for secondary or postsecondary education,
14 professional, or trade purposes shall offer such examinations or courses in a place
15 and manner accessible to persons with disabilities or offer alternative accessible
arrangements for such individuals.

16 42 U.S.C. § 12189. As required by statute, 42 U.S.C. § 12186(b), in 1991, following notice and
17 comment rulemaking, the Department issued regulations implementing title III, including 28
18 C.F.R. § 36.309 to implement Section 309 of the statute. That regulation provides that, to ensure
19 accessibility, entities offering credentialing examinations must ensure that the examination is
20 administered so as to “best ensure” that the examination results accurately reflect an individual’s
21 aptitude or achievement rather than the individual’s disability. *See* 28 C.F.R. § 36.309(b)(1)(i).
22 The testing entity must provide any modifications, accommodations, or auxiliary aids or services
23 (commonly referred to as “testing accommodations”) needed to meet the “best ensure” standard.
24 *See id.* §§ 36.309(b)(1)-(3).

25 To ensure accessibility for test takers with disabilities, the Department, in 2010 amended
26 Section 309’s implementing regulation to add provisions that codify longstanding guidance on
27 the processing of requests for testing accommodations and the appropriate bounds of
28 documentation required to support such requests. *See* 28 C.F.R. §§ 36.309(b)(1)(iv)-(vi). These

1 added provisions, which were adopted through notice-and-comment rulemaking, make clear that
 2 testing entities must respond in a “timely manner” to requests for testing accommodations and
 3 seek only reasonable documentation limited to the need for the accommodation requested. *See*
 4 *id.* §§ 36.309(b)(1)(iv), (vi). Testing entities must also give considerable weight to
 5 documentation of past testing accommodations received in similar testing situations, as well as to
 6 testing accommodations provided in response to an Individualized Education Program (IEP)¹ or
 7 Section 504 Plan,² when considering an applicant’s request for testing accommodations. *See id.*
 8 § 36.309(b)(1)(v).

9
 10 **B. Section 302 of the ADA**

11 In addition to the specific requirements for testing, Section 302 of the ADA prohibits
 12 disability-based discrimination by all private entities that own, operate, lease (or lease to) places
 13 of public accommodation. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a); 28 C.F.R. § 36.201(a). Title III’s general rule
 14 provides:

15 No individual shall be discriminated against on the basis of disability in the full
 16 and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or
 17 accommodations of any place of public accommodation by any person who owns,
 leases (or leases to), or operates a place of public accommodation.

18 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a). Title III defines a “place of public accommodation” as “a facility operated
 19 by a private entity whose operations affect commerce and fall within at least one” of twelve
 20 categories, including convention centers, lecture halls, and other places of gathering, and
 21 secondary, undergraduate, or postgraduate private schools or other places of education. *Id.*
 22 § 12181(7); 28 C.F.R. § 36.104 (definitions).

23 Title III’s general rule prohibits public accommodations from affording an individual or
 24 class of individuals, on the basis of disability, an unequal opportunity to participate in or benefit
 25 from a good, service, facility, privilege, advantage, or accommodation. 42 U.S.C.

26
 27 ¹ An IEP is an agreement describing the special education and related aids and services provided under
 the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), 20 U.S.C. § 1400 *et seq.*

28 ² A Section 504 Plan is an agreement describing special or regular education and related aids and services
 provided pursuant to section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 U.S.C. § 794.

1 § 12182(b)(1)(A)(ii); 28 C.F.R. § 36.202(b). It is also discriminatory for public accommodations
2 to provide such individuals with a good, service, facility, privilege, advantage, or
3 accommodation that is different or separate from that provided to other individuals, unless such
4 action is necessary to provide the individual or class of individuals with a good, service, facility,
5 privilege, advantage, or accommodation that is as effective as that provided to others. 42 U.S.C.
6 § 12182(b)(1)(A)(iii); 28 C.F.R. § 36.202(c). Public accommodations are also prohibited from
7 utilizing standards or criteria or methods of administration that have the effect of discriminating
8 on the basis of disability. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(1)(D); 28 C.F.R. § 36.202(c). Public
9 accommodations must also provide reasonable modifications to policies, practices and
10 procedures when needed to provide equal access to people with disabilities, 42 U.S.C.
11 § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii), and to provide auxiliary aids and services when needed to ensure equally
12 effective communication with people with disabilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iii). These
13 general prohibitions, in concert with the ADA's specific testing discrimination prohibitions,
14 reflect congressional intent to provide broad protection against disability-based discrimination,
15 toward eliminating unnecessary barriers to full and equal opportunity for all persons with
16 disabilities.

17 **C. Section 503(b) of the ADA**

18 Section 503(b) of the ADA prohibits interference with an individual's exercise or
19 enjoyment of a right granted by the ADA:

20 It shall be unlawful to coerce, intimidate, threaten, or interfere with any individual
21 in the exercise or enjoyment of, or on account of his or her having exercised or
22 enjoyed, or on account of his or her having aided or encouraged any other
23 individual in the exercise or enjoyment of, any right granted or protected by this
24 Act.

24 42 U.S.C. § 12203(b); *see also* 28 C.F.R. § 36.206(b). The implementing regulation for Section
25 503(b) states that all public and private entities are subject to this anti-interference provision.

26 *See* 28 C.F.R. § 36.206(b) ("No private or public entity shall coerce, intimidate, threaten, or
27 interfere with any individual in the exercise or enjoyment of . . . any right granted or protected by
28 the Act or this part.").

STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE DECIDED

1. Whether the United States may intervene in this action as of right.
 - a. Is the United States’ application timely?
 - b. Does the United States have a protectable interest in the enforcement of the ADA?
 - c. Is the United States so situated that disposing of the action may as a practical matter impair or impede the United States’ ability to protect its interest in the enforcement of the ADA?
 - d. Do the existing parties inadequately represent the United States’ interest in the enforcement of the ADA?

2. Whether the United States may intervene by permission.
 - a. Is the United States’ application timely?
 - b. Do the United States’ claims share a common question of law or fact with the main action?
 - c. Are any of the parties’ claims or defenses based on a statute administered by the Attorney General or a regulation issued under such a statute?
 - d. Will delay and prejudice to the parties’ rights be avoided if intervention is permitted?

ARGUMENT

A. The United States Is Entitled to Intervention as of Right

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24(a) provides that upon timely application anyone shall be permitted to intervene in an action who:

claims an interest relating to the property or transaction that is the subject of the action, and is so situated that disposing of the action may as a practical matter impair or impede the movant’s ability to protect its interest, unless existing parties adequately represent that interest.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(a)(2). An applicant for intervention as of right must prove four elements: “(1) the intervention application is timely; (2) the applicant has a significant protectable interest relating to the property or transaction that is the subject of the action; (3) the disposition of the action may, as a practical matter, impair or impede the applicant’s ability to protect its interest; and (4) the existing parties may not adequately represent the applicant’s interest. *Citizens for*

1 *Balanced Use v. Mont. Wilderness Ass'n*, 647 F.3d 893, 897 (9th Cir. 2011) (citing *Prete v.*
2 *Bradbury*, 438 F.3d 949, 954 (9th Cir. 2006) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted)); *see*
3 *also Sw. Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Berg*, 268 F.3d 810, 817 (9th Cir. 2001). As discussed
4 herein, the United States meets the prerequisites for intervention as of right.

5 1. The United States' Application for Intervention Is Timely

6 Timeliness is a threshold requirement for intervention as of right and so should be
7 considered before all other requirements. *See United States v. Oregon*, 913 F.2d 576, 588 (9th
8 Cir. 1990). When deciding whether an applicant's motion is timely, the Ninth Circuit considers
9 three factors: (1) the stage of the proceeding; (2) whether the parties would be prejudiced; and
10 (3) the reason for the delay, if any, in moving to intervene. *See id.*; *Nw. Forest Res. Council v.*
11 *Glickman*, 82 F.3d 825, 836-37 (9th Cir. 1996). Delay will weigh against intervention, but the
12 mere lapse of time alone does not necessarily preclude intervention. *See United States v.*
13 *Oregon*, 745 F.2d 550, 552 (9th Cir. 1984). Instead, timeliness should be determined by the
14 totality of the circumstances. *NAACP v. New York*, 413 U.S. 345, 366 (1973).

15 Applying these principles in this case, the United States' motion to intervene is timely
16 because the proceedings are at an early stage, intervention now would not cause prejudice to the
17 original parties, and there has been no delay by the United States in moving to intervene. DFEH
18 filed this suit in March 2012, and the United States learned of the litigation when LSAC removed
19 the action to federal court in April 2012. Consistent with the Department's administrative
20 policies, the Department undertook a deliberative evaluation of whether intervention by the
21 United States would be appropriate in this case. In the interim, LSAC filed a motion to dismiss,
22 and the United States filed a statement of interest opposing that motion. Also in the interim, real
23 parties in interest Quan, Jones, and Hennessey-Severson, filed a motion to intervene. LSAC's
24 motion to dismiss and the motion to intervene by Quan, Jones, and Hennessey-Severson are
25 pending. Discovery has not yet begun. And while the United States' proposed complaint in
26 intervention identifies additional individuals adversely affected by LSAC's actions, the United
27 States' claims turn on the same policies, practices, and procedures at issue in the pending action.
28 As such, the United States' intervention would be neither unduly burdensome nor time-

1 consuming and would not prejudice the existing parties, or the potential intervenors Quan, Jones,
2 and Hennessey-Severson, because there will be no need to reopen or re-litigate any prior
3 proceedings between the parties. In light of these facts, the United States' application for
4 intervention as of right should be deemed timely. *See Citizens for Balanced Use*, 647 F.3d at
5 897 (noting that traditional features of a timely application include being made at an early stage
6 and not causing prejudice or delay).

7 2. The United States Has a Significant Protectable Interest
8 in the Litigation

9 To warrant intervention as of right, an applicant must have a significant protectable
10 interest relating to the property or transaction that is the subject of the action. *See Citizens for*
11 *Balanced Use*, 647 F.3d at 897. To demonstrate such an interest, an applicant needs to establish
12 that its interest is protectable under some law and that there is a relationship between the legally
13 protected interest and the claims at issue. *Id.* at 897. "Whether an applicant for intervention
14 demonstrates sufficient interest in an action is a practical, threshold inquiry." *Sw. Ctr. for*
15 *Biological Diversity*, 268 F.3d at 818 (quoting *Greene v. United States*, 996 F.2d 973, 976 (9th
16 Cir. 1993) (citation omitted).

17 The United States' interest in the pending litigation supports intervention as of right. As
18 the federal agency charged with enforcing the ADA, the Department has a significant protectable
19 interest in the subject matter of the pending litigation. Underlying enactment of the ADA was
20 Congress' intent to "provide a clear and comprehensive national mandate for the elimination of
21 discrimination against individuals with disabilities." 42 U.S.C. § 12101(b)(1). Congress sought
22 "clear, strong, consistent, enforceable standards addressing discrimination against individuals
23 with disabilities," and explicitly stated that one of the purposes of the ADA was "to ensure that
24 the Federal Government plays a central role in enforcing the standards established [in the Act] on
25 behalf of individuals with disabilities" *Id.* §§ 12101(b)(2)-(3). The United States'
26 prominent enforcement role is reflected in the statutory authorization given the Attorney General
27 to commence a legal action when discrimination prohibited by the ADA takes place. *Id.*
28 § 12188. And only the Attorney General is authorized under title III to seek compensatory

1 damages for aggrieved individuals and civil penalties where appropriate to vindicate the public
2 interest. *Id.* § 12188.

3 This case directly implicates the United States' interest in enforcing titles III and V of the
4 ADA to ensure the "clear, strong, consistent, enforceable standards" envisioned by Congress.
5 *See* 42 U.S.C. § 12101(b)(2). Currently, virtually every person who wants to attend a law school
6 in America must take the LSAT, and, as a practical matter, an applicant's LSAT score may be
7 dispositive as to whether and where they are admitted, what scholarships they are eligible for,
8 and even what summer jobs or internships they can obtain. LSAC's pattern and practice of
9 discriminating against individuals with disabilities thus implicates guaranteed rights to equal
10 educational and employment opportunities that are at the heart of the ADA's protections. And
11 while Plaintiff DFEH represents a proposed statewide class, LSAC's policies and practices are
12 applicable nationwide and the United States has a significant protectable interest in ensuring that
13 LSAC brings its policies and procedures into compliance with the ADA so that no individual
14 taking the LSAT is subject to discrimination on the basis of disability.

15 Furthermore, LSAC has already challenged, in its pending motion to dismiss, the validity
16 and scope of the ADA implementing regulations promulgated by the Department. The United
17 States has a significant protectable interest in defending the Department's regulations from such
18 challenges and in ensuring that the Department's interpretation of the statute and regulation are
19 accurately presented to the Court in the course of this litigation. Accordingly, the United States'
20 significant protectable interest in ensuring that this case results in clear, consistent, enforceable
21 standards, both substantive and remedial, supports intervention as of right. *See Smith v.*
22 *Pangilinan*, 651 F.2d 1320, 1324 (9th Cir. 1981) (allowing intervention as of right by the
23 Attorney General in connection with enforcement duties related to the Certificate of Identity Act
24 of 1978 and explaining that "[c]learly, the Attorney General, who is charged with administration
25 and enforcement of the laws relating to immigration and naturalization, has an interest in a case
26 in which people seek to have it determined that they are persons who will be entitled to become
27 United States citizens"); *cf. Ceres Gulf v. Cooper*, 957 F.2d 1199, 1203-04 (5th Cir. 1992)
28 (holding the interest of the director of Office Workers' Compensation Programs in the

1 “consistent application of . . . a statutory scheme he is charged with administering” was sufficient
2 to support intervention as of right); *Nuesse v. Camp*, 385 F.2d 694, 700-01 (D.C. Cir. 1967)
3 (finding that a state government official charged with administering a banking law had an
4 interest in advocating a particular construction of the law that was sufficient to support
5 intervention as of right).

6 Additionally, because the alternative to the United States’ intervention in DFEH’s lawsuit
7 is a separate action including the United States’ ADA claims, the efficiency goals implicit in
8 Rule 24(a) are furthered if intervention is permitted here. *See Cnty. of Fresno v. Andrus*, 622
9 F.2d 436, 438 (9th Cir. 1980) (the significant protectable interest requirement “is primarily a
10 practical guide to disposing of lawsuits by involving as many apparently concerned persons as is
11 compatible with efficiency and due process”); *United States v. City of Los Angeles*, 288 F.3d
12 391, 397-98 (9th Cir. 2002) (“A liberal policy in favor of intervention serves both efficient
13 resolution of issues and broadened access to the courts.”) (internal quotation marks and citation
14 omitted). As noted previously, the Department wrote the ADA regulations at issue in this case,
15 and plays the primary role in coordinating the implementation and enforcement of the statute.
16 *See* 42 U.S.C. § 12186; 28 C.F.R. pt. 36. Through its regulatory and enforcement work, the
17 Department has accumulated significant experience in guiding covered entities in amending
18 policies, practices, and procedures to conform to the mandates of titles III and V. The
19 Department’s unique experience and familiarity with the statute and regulations at issue will
20 facilitate the efficient litigation of this dispute and promote a resolution which provides the clear,
21 consistent, enforceable standards contemplated by Congress.

22
23 3. The United States’ Interest Would Be Impaired if Intervention
Is Not Permitted

24 Under the third intervention factor, an applicant for intervention as of right must
25 demonstrate that disposition of the action may practically impair an applicant’s ability to protect
26 its interest in the subject matter of the litigation. *See Citizens for Balanced Use*, 647 F.3d at 900
27 (stressing that “intervention of right does not require an absolute certainty that a party’s interests
28 will be impaired”).

1 Federal decisions interpreting and applying the provisions of the ADA are an important
2 enforcement tool. This case, in particular, is among the first to involve claims based on the
3 Department's 2010 revised regulation on examinations and courses, as well as challenges to the
4 validity of those revisions. This Court will also address Plaintiff's claim that LSAC's flagging
5 policy violates the ADA – an issue in which the United States has expressed a substantial interest
6 and one that few courts have had the opportunity to address. As such, an unfavorable disposition
7 here may, as a practical matter, impair the United States' ability to enforce the ADA's provision
8 requiring that examinations be administered in an accessible manner and that public
9 accommodations provide full and equal enjoyment of all goods, services, privileges, advantages,
10 and accommodations without interference, coercion or intimidation. And the outcome of this
11 case, including the potential for appeals by existing parties, implicates *stare decisis* concerns that
12 warrant the United States' intervention. *See City of Los Angeles*, 288 F.3d at 400 (holding that
13 amicus status may be insufficient to protect the rights of an applicant for intervention “because
14 such status does not allow [the applicant] to raise issues or arguments formally and gives it no
15 right of appeal”). Additionally, title III of the ADA authorizes only the Attorney General to seek
16 damages, where appropriate, for individuals aggrieved by LSAC's discriminatory actions and to
17 request that the Court assess a civil penalty against LSAC; private plaintiffs have no statutory
18 right to seek either compensatory damages or civil penalties under title III or Section 503(b) of
19 the ADA. 42 U.S.C. §§ 12188(b), 12203(c). The United States has a significant protectable
20 interest in pursuing in appropriate cases, such as this one, all available relief against
21 discriminating private entities. Accordingly, because a holding in favor of LSAC may
22 negatively affect the United States' title III and V enforcement efforts, both in this case and
23 others, the third factor for intervention as of right is met.

24 4. The United States' Interest Is Inadequately Represented
25 by Existing Parties

26 The fourth and final element to justify intervention of right is inadequate representation
27 of the United States' interest by existing parties to the litigation. In determining adequacy of
28 representation, courts consider whether the interest of a present party is such that it will

1 undoubtedly make all the intervenor's arguments; whether the present party is capable and
2 willing to make such arguments; and whether the intervenor would offer any necessary elements
3 to the proceedings that other parties would neglect. *Sagebrush Rebellion, Inc. v. Watt*, 713 F.2d
4 525, 528 (9th Cir. 1983); *County of Fresno*, 622 F.2d at 438-39.

5 The existing parties to this litigation, and potential intervenors Quan, Jones, and
6 Hennessey-Severson, cannot adequately represent the United States' interests. Only the
7 Attorney General can attend to the interests of the United States. 28 U.S.C. § 517 ("The
8 Solicitor General, or any officer of the Department of Justice, may be sent by the Attorney
9 General to any State or district in the United States to attend to the interests of the United States
10 in a suit pending in a court of the United States, or in a court of a State, or to attend to any other
11 interest of the United States."). As the Ninth Circuit recognized in a case allowing private
12 parties to intervene alongside government agency defendants, "[t]he interests of government and
13 the private sector may diverge." *Sw. Ctr. for Biological Diversity*, 268 F.3d at 823; *cf. Scotts*
14 *Valley Band of Pomo Indians of the Sugar Bowl Rancheria v. United States*, 921 F.2d 924, 926-
15 27 (9th Cir. 1990) (recognizing that city government's interest could not be adequately
16 represented by another entity); *San Juan Cnty. v. United States*, 503 F.3d 1163, 1228 (10th Cir.
17 2007) (Ebel, J., dissenting) (distinguishing a local county's narrow interest from the United
18 States' broad interests).

19 In this case, the United States' interest in enforcing the ADA to advance the public
20 interest in ending disability discrimination with regard to examinations is inadequately
21 represented by the existing parties. *See Enyart v. Nat'l Conference of Bar Exam'rs*, 630 F.3d
22 1153, 1167 (9th Cir.) (discussing the public's interest in compliance with the ADA), *cert. denied*,
23 132 S. Ct. 366 (2011). Because the United States represents the public interest on a national
24 scale, its interests differ from those represented by DFEH, whose jurisdiction is confined to
25 California, and, as such, seeks relief only for victims within the state. Similarly, the United
26 States' interests also differ from those represented by potential intervenors Quan, Jones, and
27 Hennessey-Severson, whose case will be directed primarily at winning individual remedies.
28 Significantly, only the Attorney General has authority under title III of the ADA to seek

1 compensatory damages for individuals harmed by LSAC's failure to administer the LSAT in an
2 accessible manner and a civil penalty to vindicate the public interest in eliminating disability
3 discrimination. 42 U.S.C. § 12188(b). Accordingly, DFEH and potential intervenors Quan,
4 Jones, and Hennessey-Severson, cannot and will not make all the United States' arguments. The
5 United States' interest in a clear and consistent interpretation and application of relevant titles III
6 and V provisions cannot be adequately represented by the parties in this case. *Cf. Scotts Valley*
7 *Band of Pomo Indians of the Sugar Bowl Rancheria*, 921 F.2d at 926-27.

8 Furthermore, consistent with its "broader" interest in enforcing titles III and V on behalf
9 of the public nationwide, the Department brings to this action the Civil Rights Division's
10 extensive experience in investigating and litigating discrimination complaints relating to the
11 administration of examinations. And as the entity charged with formulating and issuing
12 regulations under titles III and V, the Department brings a unique expertise and familiarity with
13 key issues in this case. Such expertise will be necessary to litigate this case to advance the
14 United States' interests on behalf of the public nationwide. These facts demonstrate that the
15 interests of DFEH and potential intervenors Quan, Jones, and Hennessey-Severson, may not
16 sufficiently align with those of the United States, and support a finding that Plaintiff's and
17 potential Plaintiff-Intervenors' representation may be inadequate to protect the United States'
18 interests.

19 Because the United States can prove each of the requisite elements for Rule 24(a)(2)
20 intervention, we respectfully request that this Court grant the United States' application for leave
21 to intervene as of right.

22 **B. The United States' Application for Permissive Intervention**
23 **Should Be Granted**

24 If the United States is not entitled to intervene as of right, it should be allowed to
25 intervene by permission because the Department's involvement in this case would fall
26 squarely within that contemplated by the language of Rule 24(b):
27
28

1 (2) *By a Government Officer or Agency.* On timely motion, the court may permit
2 a federal or state governmental officer or agency to intervene if a party's claim or
defense is based on:

- 3 (A) a statute . . . administered by the officer or agency; or
4 (B) any regulation . . . issued or made under the statute or executive
order.

5 Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(b)(2).

6 The Department has the central role in administering and enforcing titles III and V of the
7 ADA. The Department's extensive regulatory work further evidences the United States' vital
8 interest in enforcing the statutes and regulations at issue on behalf of the public interest in ending
9 illegal disability discrimination. As discussed above in conjunction with the Rule 24(a) analysis,
10 the United States' application for intervention is timely.

11 Furthermore, the United States' claims against LSAC share common questions of law
12 and fact with those in the pending litigation. Rule 24(b) states, in part:

13 (1) *In General.* On timely motion, the court may permit anyone to intervene who:

14 . . .

- 15 (B) has a claim or defense that shares with the main action a common
16 question of law or fact.

17 Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(b)(1).

18 Like DFEH and potential intervenors Quan, Jones, and Hennessey-Severson, the
19 United States would assert, as a common question of law, that LSAC's conduct violates
20 title III of the ADA and the relevant implementing regulations. As an additional common
21 question of law, both DFEH and the United States assert that LSAC's conduct violates
22 title V of the ADA.

23 For these reasons, and those addressed in our discussion of intervention as of
24 right, the United States respectfully requests that this Court grant the motion to intervene
25 by permission.
26
27
28

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, this Court should grant the United States’ motion to intervene as of right. In the alternative, the Court should grant the United States’ motion for permissive intervention.

DATED: September 5, 2012

Respectfully submitted,

MELINDA HAAG, CSBN 132612
United States Attorney
Northern District of California

THOMAS E. PEREZ
Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division

SARA WINSLOW, DCBN 457643
Assistant United States Attorney
Acting Chief, Civil Division

EVE L. HILL
Senior Counselor to the Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division

GREGORY B. FRIEL
Acting Chief
ROBERTA KIRKENDALL
Special Legal Counsel
KATHLEEN P. WOLFE
Special Litigation Counsel
Disability Rights Section
Civil Rights Division

/s/ Melanie L. Proctor
MELANIE L. PROCTOR, CSBN 228971
Assistant United States Attorney
450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055
San Francisco, California 94102
Telephone: (415) 436-6730
Facsimile: (415) 436-6478
Melanie.Proctor@usdoj.gov

/s/ Nabina Sinha
NABINA SINHA
Trial Attorney
MEGAN E. SCHULLER, CSBN 281468
Trial Attorney
Disability Rights Section
Civil Rights Division
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. - NYA
Washington, D.C. 20530
Telephone: (202) 307-0663
Facsimile: (202) 305-9775
Nabina.Sinha@usdoj.gov